

March 11, 1976

applied to receive primary insurance benefits under Title II of the Social Security Act, which would come in line 18.

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, I would like to ask Senator Mills a question. If he would answer. Senator Mills could a situation arise where a person would be legitimately entitled to both of these items? The Social Security and the unemployment compensation?

SENATOR MILLS: Social Security and unemployment compensation? Senator Chambers, I understand that there is some letter form written from someone in the Labor Department to someone in the Labor Department answering yes to your question. This is not Senator Chambers, or am I in any way trying to attack anyone who is legitimately entitled to any benefit. However, there has been shown cases of flagrant misuse of unemployment compensation benefits for those people who really intend to retire, have applied to retire and go ahead and draw unemployment benefits.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Members of the Legislature. Here is what I am getting to in the remarks that I make. Lets say that a person is entitled only to either/or that you are entitled to either A or B and under the present law you are free to make a choice. If you apply to either or both currently you are not in violation of the law. There is no penalty for the mere application. If you adopt this amendment you do impose a penalty on an individual for merely filing an application. Because suppose a person would file for both and be turned down for Social Security for some reason. Now, an example arose in Omaha with an individual who works for the city filing for the school board. The Omaha School Board. This individual was informed that if he won that post, he could not keep his job as a city employee. But, from the way that the opinion read the mere filing for the office and running in the election would not be what disqualified the person. He could not serve on the school board and remain an employee. So, the choice is there. But, at least you have an opportunity to have two items before you and you can decide which one you would rather have. What this amendment would do would take away the opportunity to create a choice for yourself. The choice should not merely be to apply for one type of compensation or the other. But to have in reality the possibility of receiving one type of compensation or receiving the other and then making a choice. I am not saying that the person should receive if it violates the law, two forms of compensation. But, I think as a matter of fact that this bill imposes a penalty for merely having applied for another type of compensation which is not illegal and which does not violate the law. They are creating a new offense which currently is not an offense. Whenever you create a new offense you automatically create violators. Senator Dworak made a statement which I think is absurd where he says that he gets from the way that I am saying that the way to really fight crime is to repeal all of the laws. What I am saying is that you can pass ridiculous laws and create offenders. You can make it against the law Senator Dworak as it is in some cities to cross the street in the middle of the block. It becomes an offense because the ordinance says that it is an offense. Not because there is anything wicked or evil in that particular action, it is